

does not undercut the bid protest authority of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, Senator BURNS' legislation should result in savings to the taxpayers, while still allowing the Government to convert to metrics in building construction in a cost-effective manner. I am cosponsoring this amendment and encourage its adoption. I want to thank Senators PRESSLER and HOLLINGS, the chairman and ranking member of the Commerce Committee and Senator GLENN, for working with us in drafting the substitute amendment. I would also like to commend their staff and, especially Senator BURNS' staff, for their work on this legislation.

• Mr. KERRY. I am pleased to cosponsor with my colleague from Montana, Senator CONRAD BURNS, the Senate substitute to H.R. 2779, the Savings in Construction Act of 1996. This important legislation will amend the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 to enable lighting and masonry companies in Massachusetts and around the country to compete for Federal contracts.

Under present law, each Federal agency is required to use the metric system in its procurements, grants, and other business related activities. In certain instances, the act requires that specific products be produced in round metric dimensions. This requirement effectively mandates that such products, known as "hard-metric" products, be slightly altered from their current dimensions, thus forcing companies to undergo costly retooling and other production changes if they intend to compete for Federal contracts. Though the act contains an exception where metric conversion is likely to cause significant cost or market loss to U.S. firms, this exception has been implemented too narrowly, and, therefore, the act has caused substantial hardship to segments of the electrical and concrete masonry industries in Massachusetts and elsewhere. Indeed, several companies in my State, such as Lightolier, Inc., in Wilmington, MA, have had to turn down opportunities to compete for Federal contracts because they could not feasibly manufacture the necessary materials according to hard metric dimensions.

The implementation of the Metric Act in this manner has ultimately resulted in the U.S. Government paying a substantially inflated price for basic products such as bricks and lighting fixtures because companies that do undergo the cost of producing hard-metric products for Federal contracts often offer the products at a premium.

This bill will make commonsense changes to the procurement process. It will allow Federal agency officials to require that concrete masonry and lighting products subject to Federal procurement be expressed in metric terms. However, agency officials will not be permitted to demand that such products be produced according to hard-metric specifications without

first making specific findings that such requirements will save Federal dollars. In addition, to ensure that this bill is implemented in a commonsense manner, it requires each agency that awards construction contracts to designate a senior official as a "construction metrication ombudsman." Among other things, the ombudsman would be responsible for reviewing and responding to complaints from prospective bidders, subcontractors, and suppliers relating to agency actions on the use of the metric system in construction contracts. The ombudsman also would be responsible for ensuring that the agency is not implementing the metric system in a manner that causes significant inefficiencies or market loss to U.S. firms.

I would like to thank the Commerce Committee ranking Democrat, Senator HOLLINGS, and his fine staff, Pat Windham, for their efforts in bringing this bill forward during this especially busy time as this 104th Congress is concluded. I wish to recognize the fine work of Senator PELL, whose continued dedication to metric conversion we all have come to admire. I also wish to thank Senator JOHN GLENN and Senator TED STEVENS and their staffs on the Governmental Affairs Committee. Finally, I wish to thank Senator BURNS for sponsoring the legislation in the Senate and for his continued persistence on this matter. •

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be deemed read a third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I am just very pleased we can pass one that I will not have to object to. So, therefore, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I hear no objection. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5417) was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 2779), as amended, was deemed read a third time and passed.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have no further requests at this time. Seeing no Senator seeking recognition at this moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RETIRING MEMBERS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I just wanted to take a moment to speak a few words about three of my colleagues in the House and Senate who are going to

be retiring at the end of this year. I know many of us have spoken about our colleagues and there have been many fine words describing the attributes of those who have served here with such great distinction. It is very difficult to decide who you are going to talk about because there are so many fine people who have served here. I have chosen to talk about three people very briefly because, first of all, I know them quite well. I have worked with them. Second, because I think they exemplify the characteristics that American citizens would like to see in their public servants. Third, because in a way they are so different and yet they are all three so much alike in that the one word that describes each of the three of them is "integrity."

The reason I select these three people, one is from the House, one is a Democrat in the Senate, and one is a Republican in the Senate. My purpose for selecting these three people is, therefore, to illustrate that it does not matter which body you are in or which party you are in, you can serve the American people well if you have that characteristic of integrity and you can be respected by your peers as well.

The three people I want to say a word about are Senator HANK BROWN from Colorado, Senator PAUL SIMON from Illinois, and Representative BOB WALKER from Pennsylvania, all three of whom will be leaving at the end of this session. As I said, one could talk about many others. I heard some great statements about our colleague AL SIMPSON. I think we all get a smile on our face when we think of the many stories he has told us—and Judge HEFLIN and so many others. Again, let me focus on these three.

First, Senator HANK BROWN from Colorado is leaving after one term in the Senate. I find it interesting that he says he is leaving because the decisions that he is making now, he says, are just not as objective as they were when he first came. He feels that his decisions are now more influenced by having been in this body. Mr. President, I think all of us here would say that if HANK BROWN is concerned that he is not deciding things on an objective basis, it might say a great deal about the rest of us, because I am sure, Mr. President, you would agree there is not anybody in this body who tackles issues on a more objective basis than HANK BROWN.

He does not come with a great deal of bias. He certainly is not very partisan. He says what is right, what is wrong, what do I know about this and what should we do, and if he is the only one who takes that position, he takes the position because he thinks it is the right thing to do. When he thinks he has been, in effect, slightly corrupted by the institution in a political way, what does it say about all of the rest of us? I know we all hold ourselves up to his standard as being the standard for judging issues.

I just want to compliment Senator BROWN for being independent, for being

smart, for being honest, for being wise, for having integrity, and finally, Mr. President, for his unfailing courtesy. I have never known Senator BROWN not to be courteous to those around him regardless of party, regardless of circumstance. We will miss him in the U.S. Senate.

Another person with the same unfailing courtesy and integrity is Senator PAUL SIMON from Illinois. Now, PAUL SIMON and I are of different political parties and certainly our philosophies differ a great deal, yet I think working with Senator SIMON is a good example of how significant philosophical differences do not mean that you cannot work with each other and respect each other. He has been as courteous to me as any Member of this body, notwithstanding the fact we are of different political parties.

In the tension-filled atmosphere we sometimes find ourselves in, I find that to be a comfortable refuge. I do not think anyone here is given more respect in either body than Senator SIMON because of his integrity and his unfailing courtesy. I hope I have reciprocated in my dealings with him.

He has also, I think, influenced us because when he speaks, we listen. He always has something important to say. That is especially so because we know that he approaches issues honestly. As I said, Mr. President, I will miss his company in this body.

Finally, my colleague in the House, BOB WALKER. I served with Representative WALKER when I was a Member of the House. I worked with him on mutual matters of interest since I have been in this body. Like HANK BROWN and PAUL SIMON, BOB WALKER is a man of unquestionable integrity. He knows what he believes. He knows why he believes it. He acts upon those beliefs without undue influence by the forces around him. His actions have always been characterized by courage and by adherence to principle, which is somewhat in short supply in Washington on occasion.

He, too, has had enormous influence on the legislation in this Congress, much of it behind the scenes, because people know him to be well-versed in the issues and to be very honest in his approach to them. I also want to say one last thing about Representative WALKER. As much as anyone I have known, he represents an attitude about the future that I think we can all emulate. He has great confidence in the future of this country because he has great confidence in our ability to advance based upon the technology that is there for us to discover, and he has supported a great many projects as chairman of the Space, Science, Technology Committee in the House, because of his confidence and optimism in our future.

Mostly, BOB WALKER has been my personal friend, and I will miss him a great deal, as well. So, Mr. President, much has been said about a lot of the people who will be leaving this body

and the House. I mention these three because I have worked closely with all of them. I respect them very much. In some respects, they epitomize the qualities that we respect as colleagues, and I know the American people respect. We will miss them and all of the others who will be retiring at the end of this year.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FAREWELL TO SENATOR MARK HATFIELD

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, in the time that we have, prior to the time the majority leader comes back to the floor, I have a couple of statements that I would like to make with regard to two very respected colleagues.

Mr. President, in the study of political courage, "Profiles in Courage", Senator John F. Kennedy observed that "in the United States of America, where brother once fought against brother, we do not judge a man's bravery under fire by examining the banner under which he fought."

With this in mind, I say farewell to a Senator who has been a study in political courage, the Senior Senator from Oregon, MARK HATFIELD.

His has, indeed, been a career of bold stands. From his early days in the Senate, when he cosponsored legislation to limit American's involvement in the war in Vietnam, to his votes on the Persian Gulf war, to his recent vote against the balance budget constitutional amendment, Senator HATFIELD has consistently taken independent, courageous stands.

I have not always with him. But that is not the issue.

The issue is the courage each Senator shows in taking a stand for a principle he or she holds dear. The willingness to place principle above politics. The country over one individual career.

Indeed, Mr. President, Senator HATFIELD's entire life has been one of courage, responsibility, devotion to country. As a young naval officer in World War II, he saw battle at Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and was one of the first Americans to enter the rubble of what was left of Hiroshima following the atomic bombing.

His deep aversion to weaponry and war following World War II led him to cast the lone dissenting vote on resolution at the 1965 and 1966 National Governor's Conferences supporting President Johnson's policies in Vietnam. And it led him to sponsor legislation, like the Nuclear Freeze Resolution, to halt the nuclear arms race.

He became the youngest Secretary of State in Oregon's history, the State's

first two-term Governor in the 20th century, and the longest serving Senator in the history of his State.

While serving in the Senate for nearly three decades, Senator HATFIELD has never allowed himself to be confined to or consumed by institutional duties, as he has maintained a life outside this Chamber. As a former political science professor and dean of students, for example, he has retained his intellectual interests and pursuits. This includes authoring three books and authoring four others.

But I also point out that Senator HATFIELD's career in public service has been one of cooperation and reconciliation, as well as hard, tenacious work. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he has earned the respect and admiration of Senate Democrats and Senate gains like Senator ROBERT BYRD.

He has struggled to maintain that delicate balance between protecting the precious, beautiful environment of his home State, while preserving the economic viability of Oregon's industries.

His efforts have obviously been recognized and appreciated by the people of his home State. In four decades in Oregon politics, he has never lost an election.

In announcing his retirement, Senator HATFIELD spoke of the one great sacrifice of having served five terms in the Senate—"30 years of voluntary separation from the State" he loves. Now, as he says, it is "time to come home to Oregon." I wish him and his wife, Antoinette, peace and prosperity in returning home. I can only say that the Senate's loss is Oregon's gain.

#### SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute today to a very distinguished Member who is retiring this year. I am referring to Senator WILLIAM S. COHEN, who, as we all know, has made the decision to leave the Senate at the end of this session of Congress.

I think it is fair to say that with unanimity we all agree that this man will be missed.

Since he was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1972 and later, in 1978, to the Senate, BILL COHEN has shown a genuine commitment to public service.

BILL COHEN has made unique contributions as a man with great knowledge of, and a deep respect for, the power of language. He has been a champion of the cause of making political discourse more civil and has promoted civility within this body through his daily interaction with each of us. The author or coauthor of eight books, he has graced the Senate with elegant speeches on some of the most important issues of our time. They have also, on more than one occasion, served as a stern warning of the cost of straying from principle.

I recall when Senator COHEN stood on this floor 5 years ago during the debate